

Dr Norman C. MacDonald
PLANNING CONSULTANT
Baliscate Industrial Estate
Tobermory
Isle of Mull
PA75 6QA

4th of November 2019

To whom it may concern

I hereby make a formal representation regarding Local Review Body Reference: 19/0007/LRB and Planning Application No. 19/01016/PP

Policy DM 1 of the local development plan sets out the policy of the planning authority for the various Development Management Zones identified in the plan. The application site is located in the zone identified as the Countryside Zone. This zone is referred to in paragraph (E) of DM 1.

This policy states Encouragement shall be given to sustainable forms of development as follows:-

“LDP DM 1(E) Within the Countryside Zone up to small scale on appropriate infill, rounding off and redevelopment sites and changes of use of existing buildings. There is a presumption against development that seeks to extend an existing settlement.”*

This application site does not comply with infilling, rounding off or redevelopment of existing buildings, and **is** seeking to extend the existing settlement pattern. Therefore concluding, this application is contrary to policy and was rightly refused planning permission, in accordance with the policy.

There was a pre-application in 2016 for the refused site, the Council advised at this juncture that this application site was contrary to policy, and on that basis would be recommended for refusal, with the appellants themselves acknowledging in their own statement that this application is in the countryside zone. Despite receiving this advice, they relentlessly pursued this application.

The appellants design statement which was submitted may explain the application. It is naïve/arrogant to think that this gives an automatic planning approval. This application was purely an emotional, knee jerk reaction to application no. 19/00812/PP which was approved, as intimated in their own report.

It is clear from their appeal statement , the appellant is obviously fully aware of the planning process, as they were consulted when there was a *"call for sites"* from Argyll and Bute Council, but were remiss not to request for this site to be included in the new local plan. To state *"the window of opportunity was too narrow to meet,"* is ludicrous, as these timescales are mandatory parameters set by the Scottish Government.

Even if this site was asked for inclusion in the emerging local plan, it would have been unlikely to be included as if it was thought a relevant site for future development it would have been identified by officers and included in the emerging local plan. It has not been. So therefore, officers would have looked at this and deemed it unsuitable.

Structural and Local Plan are in place for specific reasons. The reason for this is so that development occurs in a controlled manner, not sporadic and whimsical, as per this application. To allow this appeal to be granted, it would make a complete mockery of the systems set in place by the Scottish Government at a national, regional and local level.

Unfortunately, yet predictably, the appellants document is full of emotion, hearsay and inaccuracies. The assertion that all objectors are from “immediate family members”, is over dramatised and completely untrue. All objections are from adjoining neighbours, apart from myself, who is neither an immediate family member nor involved in any family feud. I have been employed as a planning consultant to act on behalf of the families affected by this application, and my genetic linkage to both appellant and objectors bares no influence on my professionalism or my advice to my employers.

In addition to the above it is beyond disingenuous to suggest that these houses would be used to house potential employees, as there was no evidence of this in the original planning application, or no supporting evidence or information. I refer to the report of handling for this application. *“In terms of Supplementary Guidance SG LDP HOU 1, there is no requirement to provide for affordable units in this case. The applicants also state that the dwelling houses could be made available for employees of the applicants or otherwise however no specific details of claim of locational/operational need has been put forward. Tobermory has the highest concentration of affordable homes on Mull and the LDP has made provision for specific housing allocations, including for affordable housing, and there is no evidence that these are at capacity or are undevelopable.”* Therefore, illustrating that provision is already made in the LDP for this and that there is no evidence to suggest that this is at capacity.

This is an open area of countryside with an open outlook, in a very rural setting. To effectively build another line of houses in front of the established row of houses would not comply with the existing settlement pattern, would not comply with the structural and local plans and would amount to planning blight

I therefore in good faith conclude, the Councillors’ reviewing this LRB, should uphold your officers’ recommendation for continued refusal.

Yours faithfully

Dr N C MacDonald. BSc (HONS)_{GLAS} MSc PLANNING_{HW} PhD_{EDIN}.